

Remarks

Claims 2-16 are pending in the application, of which claims 2, 4, 6, and 9-13 are rejected, and claims 3,5,7,8 and 14-16 are objected to. By this paper, Applicant amends claims 7, 9 and 12; and cancels claims 3, 8 and 15-16.

Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings for not showing "every feature of the inventions specified in the claims" and specifically the "coordinate net" in claims 8 and 16. Claims 8 and 16 are canceled and Applicant now believes the drawings to be in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has rejected claims 8 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 paragraph 1, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant has canceled claims 8 and 16 and now believes the application to be in condition for allowance.

Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claim 7 due to informalities as missing a transition word. Applicant has amended claim 7 to correct the informality and respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections to claim 7.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 2, 4, 6 and 9-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Koscielny et al (US 7,153,246 B2) in view of Senegal (US 2007/0083975 A1).

Claim 9 has been amended to include the limitations of dependent claim 3. The Examiner objected to claim 3 and indicated that it would be allowable if written in independent form. Applicant believes that amended claim 9 to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 2, 4, 6 and 10-11 depend from claim 9. Since amended claim 9 is believed to be in condition for allowance and is nonobvious over the combination of Koscielny and Senegal, dependent claims are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 12 has been amended to include the limitations of dependent claim 15. The Examiner objected to claim 15 and indicated that it would be allowable if written in independent form. Applicant believes that amended claim 12 to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 13 depends from claim 12. Since amended claim 12 is believed to be in condition for allowance and is nonobvious over the combination of Koscielny and Senegal, dependent claim 13 is also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner objected to claims 3, 5, 7, and 14-15 as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but indicated that each would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of its respective base claims, as well as any intervening claims.

Claim 3 has been cancelled and the limitations of claim 3 have been added to amended claim 9, which is now believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 5 depends from amended claim 9, and is now believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 7 depends from amended claim 9, and is now believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 15 is cancelled and the limitations of claim 15 have been added to amended claim 12, which is now believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 14 depends from amended claim 12 and is now believed to be in condition for allowance.

New Claim

Claim 17 has been added and contains the limitations of unamended claim 9 and claim 7. No new matter was added by this amendment. The Examiner indicated that claim 7 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of its respective base claims, as well as any intervening claims. Therefore, claim 17 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, Applicant believes the application to be in condition for allowance, whereby allowance is hereby requested.

Please charge any fees or credit any overpayments as a result of the filing of this paper to our Deposit Account No. 02-3978.

Respectfully submitted,

Anatoly Ivanovich Grigoriev

By /Tiffany A. Fidler/
Tiffany A. Fidler
Reg. No. 65,366
Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: 11/03/2009

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351